

checks, to foster innovation in the check collection system without mandating receipt of checks in electronic form, and to improve the overall efficiency of the Nation's payments system, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 760, PARTIAL-BIRTH ABORTION BAN ACT OF 2003

Mr. SESSIONS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 108-139) on the resolution (H. Res. 257) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 760) to prohibit the procedure commonly known as partial-birth abortion, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

DEMOCRAT TAX CUT INCLUDES WORKING AMERICAN FAMILIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, when we were here in the House the other day to vote on the third tax cut of the President, the majority leader stated that we were going to be back and they were going to be back with another tax cut.

Well, we have a tax cut. It is on behalf of working families and their children, so I would like to take the majority leader up on his offer to have another tax cut immediately following the first three tax cuts that they have passed, and bring up this tax cut that he said we were going to have, one right after we got back from session. We were going to have another tax cut. Not even was the ink dry, but we were beginning to work on another tax cut.

I found it a little ironic that night when I heard the majority leader say that, because I thought this was going to be the jobs and growth tax cut. Why do we need another tax cut if this was going to be so effective? Maybe it will produce the same results the first tax cut did, which has resulted in 2.75 million Americans losing their jobs, 5 million Americans losing their health care, \$1 trillion worth of foreclosed corporate assets, and 2 million Americans walking out of the middle class into poverty.

But they want to do another tax cut; so, as we say in Chicago, I've got you one. That is, I have a tax cut for middle-class, working-class families and their children, the Rangel-DeLauro-Davis bill. It focuses our priorities on working families and children. It makes good economic sense, and it makes good moral sense. It reflects, most importantly, our values.

Now, the President during the State of the Union said that we would not leave our burdens to our children, that we would solve our problems today. I

cannot think of anything that more reflects those types of statements, and those values embedded in that statement than that we would focus our tax cuts on our children, the children of working parents who get up every day and struggle to do right. They do not choose welfare, they choose a paycheck.

As my colleague, the gentleman from Texas, mentioned, we have to reward work. These are the children of working families.

Now, in 1997, we had a balanced budget, a budget that was balanced with our priorities as well as our values. It expanded the earned income tax credit, it offered a \$500 per child tax credit, and it provided 10 million uninsured children of working parents health care. It also cut the capital gains tax.

We also created a tax credit for higher education, and we did it while balancing our budget. We met our obligations. We invested in the long-term growth of this country's economy. We got the economy moving by balancing the budget. We did not hurt the long-term opportunities, but we invested in education, health care, and the environment.

Now this administration has chosen to have three tax cuts. What have they resulted in? \$3 trillion have been added to the Nation's debt, and nearly 3 million Americans are without jobs. What a deal. What an opportunity.

Now, the first excuse for having left 12 million children of working parents out of this tax cut was, we forgot. We did not know. That is interesting. When it came to closing the tax loophole for corporations that use the ZIP code of Bermuda, we did not forget them. We took that right out. We said, that does not belong in this tax cut.

That is \$30 billion of lost revenue that American working families have to make up. We did not forget them. We did not leave them behind. We remembered what ZIP code they were in. We remembered their area code. We got them right back where they belonged. Those are our pioneers. Those are our rangers, as they are known in some parts of this country.

Now, the other excuse given was, these people do not pay taxes. That is funny, because when they get their paycheck their FICA is withdrawn, their State income tax is withdrawn, their property taxes they have to pay. They pay taxes.

What is interesting, the very crowd they are criticizing was the crowd Ronald Reagan praised when he created in 1986 the earned income tax credit. Ronald Reagan was the one who signed this into law. President Clinton was the one who doubled it in 1993 and expanded it in 1997. We worked across party lines to help every child. These are America's children. We did not discriminate. We surely do not discriminate against the children of millionaires.

Where are our common values? How do we choose to give such a high priority on the depreciation of machinery,

yet we cannot appreciate our children? How do we make that choice?

I know the men and women on the other side. They are good people with good values. These are not the values their parents raised them with, to choose the depreciation of machinery over the appreciation of our children.

I believe that we have a tax cut. Democrats offer one in good faith, the type of tax cut Republicans have voted for both in the other body as well as in the past. As our majority leader of the House said before the last tax bill was voted on, we are going to come back and we are going to do another tax cut. The Senate leader said that we are going to do another tax cut.

We have a tax cut. We stand ready to work with them and fulfill their obligations to get another tax cut passed, one that works and benefits our economy, the children of working families, enshrines the value of work, and holds that up; not just rewards passive income, but rewards active work.

VETERANS, CHILDREN, AND GREEDY, UNPATRIOTIC CORPORATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STRICKLAND) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to talk about veterans, to talk about children, and to talk about greedy, unpatriotic corporations.

First of all, I would like to say a word about our veterans. We passed a budget in this Congress which, over the 10-year budget cycle, will underfund veterans' programs by \$6.2 billion.

□ 1915

And included in that budget are certain assumptions which will greatly increase the financial burdens that will be placed upon the backs of our veterans. First of all, a decision has been made that if you are a priority-eight veteran, considered high-income, and, quite frankly, in my district that could be someone who makes as little as \$22,000 a year, you are considered high-income, and so you would no longer be able to enroll in the VA health care system.

Now that is fairly shameful. In the Committee on Veterans Affairs earlier today, one of my colleagues said that he was a priority-eight veteran and he really did not object to being excluded. Well, the fact is that I and all of the rest of us who serve in this body make about \$150,000 a year. It is probably a little easier for us to pay for our health care than it would be for a veteran who makes as little as \$22,000 a year.

Well, there are other things that this budget does. It assumes that we will charge priority-seven and -eight veterans an annual \$250 enrollment fee, something that we have never done in the past. So these veterans are now going to be asked to pay an additional \$250 annual enrollment fee.